Date: Tue, 8 Feb 94 04:30:24 PST

From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>

Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu

Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu

Precedence: Bulk

Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #44

To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 8 Feb 94 Volume 94 : Issue 44

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu> Send subscription requests to: <ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu> Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 6 Feb 1994 22:38:04 GMT

From: pacbell.com!sgiblab!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!

ez006683@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2imlspINN9pi@abyss.west.sun.com>, <2imsjs\$mpr@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <CKM2yJ.F40@news.Hawaii.Edu>u

Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

Jeff Herman (jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu) wrote:

: [Shame on you Dianne! That one simple question ``Why?'' can lead to

: a rise of hundreds of folks' blood pressure for weeks on end!]

Nice to know i'm not the only one wo screwed up the obscure .sig !:-)

: Jeffrey NH6IL jherman@hawaii.edu

Dan

- -

```
* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa
                   Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu
                 Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102
*
                            Davis CA 95616
*-----
       I do not speak for the University of California....
       and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!
-----
Date: Sun, 6 Feb 1994 22:52:36 GMT
From: pacbell.com!sgiblab!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!torn!
csd.unb.ca!UNBVM1.CSD.UNB.CA@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu
References <06FEB94.12030322.0075@UNBVM1.CSD.UNB.CA>,
<2j39od$k0a@tribune.usask.ca>, <CKtGtt.6G2@world.std.com>UNBV
Subject: Re: Operating in Canada?
In article <CKtGtt.6G2@world.std.com> cravit@world.std.com (Matthew Cravit N9VWG)
writes:
>In article <2j39od$k0a@tribune.usask.ca>,
>Peter Hardie, 4805,, <hardie@herald.usask.ca> wrote:
>>> In article <CKsGp5.2KF@world.std.com> drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker)
writes:
>>>>According to that government official I talked to, as well as the
>>>>rules near as I can tell, you are NOT, repeat NOT, restricted to your
>>>>US amateur privileges while in Canada, contrary to what the ARRL rule
>>>>book says. That means that it is perfectly legal for a General, while
>>>>in Canada, to use phone on 14.110, or CW on 7.010. It's somewhat
>>>>frustrating, because others have reported being told otherwise. But
>>> I disagree. You are stuck with US limits when you visit Canada
>>You can disagree, but he's right. The regs clearly state that a U.S. amateur
>>who is a U.S. citizen AND resident and who is qualified to send and receive
>
>This is what the Canadian regs say. But the US regs say that an
>amateur operating abroad under a US license and reciprocal treaty must
>not exceed what their US license allows, even if permitted by the
>foreign regulations.
>/Matthew
>Matthew Cravit, N9VWG
                                   | All opinions expressed here are
```

Right on Matthew. I know of an American ham who was visiting Canada

and who checked into a net on 3750 LSB. On LSB part of your signal is *below* 3750 and even visiting Canada, he ended up receiving a nasty letter from the FCC. If the same American had had a Canadian callsign, of course, he would have been ok.

		A I	\/E O N
1	117 C	Nadeau	VEQUE
_	uli	wautau	V L 7 L IV
